



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,368	03/08/2004	Brent Garson		2241

7590 03/31/2006
Marvin L. Union
13530 Heath Road
Novelty, OH 44072

EXAMINER

ALEXANDER, REGINALD

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1761

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/796,368

Applicant(s)

GARSON ET AL.

Examiner

Reginald L. Alexander

Art Unit

1761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 15, 16, 20, 23 and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by DeKoning et al.

There is disclosed in DeKoning an espresso making apparatus, comprising: a supply 38 of pressurized hot water; a pressure chamber 2 having first and second openings; a piston 3; a cam 30; a motor 12; a cam follower 27; a sensor (col. 4, lines 57-63) for sensing motor current; a control 31 for stopping the motor when a predetermined motor current is sensed; a fluid passageway 7; and an outlet 26 from the pressure chamber.

Art Unit: 1761

In regards to claims 10 and 11, the operation of the device fails to provide any structural limitations to the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-5, 17-19, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeKoning in view of Schmed.

Schmed discloses that it is known in the art to use a voltage or torque sensor to stop a driving motor 8 from operating a brewing piston 6 (col. 6, lines 8-15).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to substitute the current sensor of DeKoning with the sensor disclosed in Schmed, in order to provide an alternative means for stopping the motor and controlling movement of the piston within the pressure chamber.

Schmed also discloses a hot water passageway which extends through the brewing piston.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the location of the fluid passageway of DeKoning with that disclosed in Schmed, in order to ensure that hot water contacts the coffee as the piston moves towards the coffee.

Claims 7-9, 12, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeKoning in view of Karg et al.

Art Unit: 1761

Karg discloses that it is known in the art to have a first piston 36, 37 and second piston 29, 30 movable within a pressure chamber 25, 26, and a latch means (gears) 60 for latching the second piston in a first closed position.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the device of DeKoning with a second piston and latch arrangement as taught in Karg, in order to ensure a good compression of the coffee within the pressure chamber.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeKoning in view of Karg et al. as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Schmed.

Schmed discloses a hot water passageway which extends through the brewing piston.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the location of the fluid passageway of DeKoning, as modified by Karg, with that disclosed in Schmed, in order to ensure that hot water contacts the coffee as the piston moves towards the coffee.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The patents to Harada, Brill, Wu and Versini are cited for their disclosure of the state of the art.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reginald L. Alexander whose telephone number is 571-272-1395. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

Art Unit: 1761

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

rla
28 March 2006


Reginald L. Alexander
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1761